DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 209 SP 017 612

AUTHOR Hyatt, Norman F.
TITLE Community Education Competencies.
PUB DATE 11 Dec 80
NOTE 15p.: Paper presented to the National Council of States on Inservice Education (San Diego, CA, December 11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Education: *Competence: Financial Support: Goal Orientation: *Leadership Qualities: *Leadership Training: Needs Assessment: Policy Formation: Postsecondary Education: Principals: *Program Development: Resource Allocation: Superintendents

ABSTRACT

Competencies considered to be essential to the community school district superintendent, the education coordinator, school principals and superintendents, and the community education director are examined. High priority is given to those qualities the community has a right to expect from its educational leaders. Competencies in the areas of public relations, program planning, research and evaluation, funding, and policy implementation are identified as they relate to the role of each of these leaders in community education. Throughout this discussion, emphasis is placed on the concept of community leadership as stewardship of all human and material resources of the community. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED199209

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norman F. Hyatt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMPETENCIES

A Paper

Presented to

National Council of States on Inservice Education

San Diego, California

by

Norman F. Hyatt, Ed.D.

Professor, Educational Administration
Director, Rocky Mountain Communtiy Education Center

Brigham Young University

Provo, Utah

December 11, 1980

SP017612

COMMUNITY EDUCATION COMPETENCIES

(Or, What do I have to do to conclude that
I've done what I'm supposed to do.)

There are several approaches that can be taken in the discussion of a topic as broad as this one. Obviously, one may choose to state a premise, defend it, illustrate a case dealing with it, and cite implications pertaining to the respective alternatives, and finally draw conclusions that one or more of the alternatives is viable. Another approach is that of declaring a position and citing all the rationale in defense of the position, even at the expense of overlooking drawbacks and obstacles. In this kind of a situation too often one's blinders are so narrowly focused that the conflict between trees and the forest takes over. A third approach, is in some respects more academic if for no other reason than it starts with definitions.

DEFINITIONS:

What is "community education"? Many people in recent years have developed their own definition for the term community education. It is easy to start with Webster's definitions. He defines community as 1, a unified body of individuals, as a state or commonwealth, the people with common interests living in a particular area broadly, the area itself, (the problems of a large area), the interacting population of various kinds of individuals in a common location, a group of people with a common characteristic or interest living together within a larger society, a group linked by a common policy, a body of persons or nations having a common history; 2, society, at large; and 3, joint ownership or participation, common character--likeness, social activity--fellowship, and a social state or condition.

Education, as defined by Webster, is the action or process of educating or being educated; also, a stage of such a process, the knowledge and development resulting from an educational process; the field of study that deals mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools.

When taken separately, these two terms may be dealt with quite handily. However, when combined into the one term, community education, quite a different story unfolds. In the first place, simple mathematics can show that well over a hundred (12 x 9) individual simple combinations of the two terms can be made. If pairs or groups of the parts of the definitions are employed, the mind cannot imagine just how many combinations of definitions can be created.

Instead of leaving the situation in an unresolved state, there are two definitions worthy of consideration. The first has all the power of a nuclear explosion wrapped up in three words, and reference is not made to I LOVE YOU, even through the power might be equal or exceed that of those three little words. A leading community educator in the U.S., Dr. Keith Rogers,

states that Community Education simply is APPLIED ETERNAL PROGRESSION. Within this definition, community education is boundless. What are the limitations of applied? Until ALL of the resources known or unknown at present to mankind are exhausted, totally exhausted not 99 and 44/100 percent, we will not have fulfilled the meaning of applied. The term eternal also carries a never ending meaning. Webster states a first definition for eternal as having infinite duration, everlasting. And, progression refers to moving forward, proceeding, or developing a higher, better or more advanced stage or state. Thus, when community education is defined as applied eternal progression it is quite clear that only human limitations will prevent accomplishing great things when we engage in any sort of activities that are described under the umbrella of community education.

For the purposes of this discussion, a more tangible definition of community education is worthy of consideration, not that anything that could be said under the above three word definition wouldn't also apply under a different definition, because it would appertain. In the sixties, Dr. Jack Minzey defined community education: "Community Education is a process that concerns itself with everything that affects the well being of all citizens within a community." This definition extends the role of community education from one of the traditional concepts of teaching children to one of identifying the needs, problems and wants of the community and then assisting in the development (or the identification) of facilities, programs, staff and leadership toward the end of improving the entire community. In 1971, Jack Minzey and Clyde LeTarte polished their thinking and combined their ideas with those of others who were speaking out about community education when they stated that

> "Community Education is a philosophical concept which serves the entire community by providing for all of the educational needs of all of its community members. It uses the local school to serve as the catalyst for bringing community resources to bear on community problems in an effort to develop a positive sense of community, improve community living, and develop the community process toward the end of self-actualization."

This definition which was proferred nearly a decade ago is standing the test of time, thus, it can be said that it is a viable definition of community education.

There are three more concerns in addition to those related to definitions which must be coped with prior to embarking on the basic issues of Community Education Competencies. The first one is that of "Who is a community educator"? Who should have these Community Education competencies? EACH member of a community is a community educator. This all-inclusiveness obviously creates problems, but in reality, each one of us citizens is a community educator. However, for purposes of this discussion, we will be dealing with the term community educator in a rather formal sense limiting our attention to those people who have a title or carry specific responsibilities for or related to the concept of community education or the community school, which is the vehicle for implementing the concept.

The second concern is that of competencies. Webster defines competence as "having requisite or adequate ability or qualities; having the capacity to function or develop in a particular way." Webster suggests a synonym, sufficient. The concern is not with the ability to define what competencies are, or even to wrestle with ways and means of modifying behavior to permit tasks to be performed. Rather, it is what we do with the competencies after they're defined.

A much greater and real concern is that the ESTABLISHMENT OF A MINIMUM STANDARD OF PERFORMANCE SIMULTANEOUSLY ESTABLISHES A MAXIMUM. It seems as though an inate trait of mankind is that minimums become maximums. Minimum quotas, standards, or criteria can be met, but we tend not to exceed the minimum and even strive for a maximum. Putting it another way, minimum standards of expectation almost always guarantee minimum production and performance. This is a travesty! One of the most glaring examples of this problem that we face today relates to the concepts surrounding a "forty hour work week" and "minimum wages."

One other parameter needed in a discussion of competencies is that of STEWARDSHIP. Too frequently others have prescribed for us the rules, regulations, and policies of jobs and job expectations and job descriptions which are corolaries to the minimum becoming the maximum. However, there is a higher order of expectation of performance that heretofor has gone almost totally ignored, thus unnoticed and unused. It is called STEWARDSHIP. For several years in the Department of Educational Administration at Brigham Young University we have been trying to do something to counter the minimum/maximum dilema. We've woven into the very core of educational administration leadership training the concept of Stewardship because we believe this new approach is logical and does not inhibit one's reaching his or her maximum potential. Perhaps oversimplified and not a Webster definition simply stated, Stewardship "makes it safe for each of us to find our own best way" of doing whatever has to be done. There may be legal, moral, time, financial, or other basic constraints that must be dealt with, but knowing them and knowing or learning how to deal with them permits each of us to function without a fear of recrimination while we exploit our own abilities and magnify our callings. An extremely broad spectrum of opportunities opens up in front of us under the simple and basic premise of stewardship. The concept of stewardship further is developed later.

Let's examine some of the competencies considered to be related to four classifications of community educators. First are the competencies related to a Community School District Superintendent. In a study undertaken at Arizona State University about two years ago under a U.S. Federal Grant, and expanded somewhat at Brigham Young University last year, the subjects of the study who were superintendents reported the three most important competencies related to a superintendent were:

1. The ability to develop broad policies regarding community education relationships to the total educational program.
2. The ability to develop receptivity in school district personnel for community education.
3. The ability to establish a public information program with a two-way flow of information and recommendations.

Several considerations in addition to the assessment of importance were given to the stated competencies. The issues of level of usage, type of training needed to acquire the competency, the classification of the part of community education in which the competency is best located, and the evidence that one possesses the competency were all examined.

With respect to the first competency stated above, the ability to develop broad policies regarding community education relationships to the total educational program, the participants in the study reported that 60 percent of this competency would be at the Application level of usuage, 20 percent would be at the Understanding level, and 20 percent at the Familiarity level. Application refers to being able to apply or actually carry out the procedures and judgements implied and being able to directly demonstrate to and supervise others in performing procedures and making judgements. Understanding refers to one's ability to explain, analyze methods and procedures used, and exercise judgment about the adequacy of procedures and judgments implied. Also, can one teach others? Familiarity has to do with merely knowing about the procedures and methods implied and one's ability to discuss the issue intelligently and follow explanations or analyses without having to be taught about it.

With respect to the preferred means of training to acquire the competency of developing policies, it's interesting to note that half of the participants in the research cited above felt that pre-service training was preferred and the other half that in-service would do the job.

These same subjects of the research activity classified this competency as being part of the "Climate" aspect of community education. Other classifications of the field of community education include Public Relations, Program Planning, Research and Evaluation, Funding, Program Development, Program Management, and Philosophy, Goal Setting, and Policy Implementation.

Perhaps the most critical consideration to be made regarding competencies is that of the evidence which demonstrates competence. Obviously, the best evidence that a Community School District Superintendent is able to develop board policies which relate community education to the total educational program is the inclusion of a set of community education policies in the district policy manual.

Turning next to the competency of developing receptivity in school district personnel for community education, the research revealed that 40 percent of the competency would be at the application level with the other 60 percent at the understanding level. About half of the means of training to acquire the competency is through either pre-service or a combination of pre-and in-service training while the other half of the means is either self-acquired or a combination of self and incidental training. This particular competency is also considered as part of developing a climate for community education. One evidence of competency in this area is by or through a series of formal and informal meetings with staff to present the values, plausibility, and merits of community education. Another evidence is that of the receptivity, cooperation and support of staff when community education activities are proposed and carried out.

The other very highly important competency of establishing a public information program obviously is a public relations effort. Most of this competency, 80 percent, is at the application level; the other 20 percent is at the understanding level. Even though slightly more of the subjects of the research felt that the preferred means of training was pre-service, some inservice and some self acquired means are also used. Competence is demonstrated by or through the utilization of print and electronic media to explain community education to the public and the encouragement of public support and involvement in community education. Again, proof of the effectiveness of this competency is the actual involvement of citizens in community education activities or/and the support of community education activities or community education related propositions at the polls. Otherwise, going through the motions is not much more than having "a lot to do about nothing."

Taking a look at the competencies of a Community School Principal, it was found in the research referred to above that five specific competencies were deemed to be of greatest importance. These are:

1. The ability to varify roles and responsibilities.
2. The ability to generate and maintain a supportive attitude with staff and community.
3. The ability to employ procedures for establishing organizational goals.
4. The ability to evaluate the community education program in relation to education program goals.
5. The ability to comprehend and implement policy and goals consistent with district philosophy.

Similar considerations as were applied on behalf of the community school superintendent were also made with respect to the school principal. The competencies were judged as being in part at the application level in all of these instances. Two of the competencies, the ability to clarify roles and responsibilities and the ability to evaluate the community education program, were deemed to be at the understanding level of performance to a greater extent than at the application level. There seems to be a fairly uniform distribution of preferred means of training to acquire the competencies with approximately a third being acquired in pre-service training, nearly a third by in-service training, and slightly more than a third of the competency being acquired through self efforts.

With regard to maintaining a supportive attitude, as might be expected, the acquisition of the competency was suggested to be mostly on the part of an individual with very little acquired through pre or in-service training.

For the community school principal the competency of role clarification and acquisition of supportive attitude are both classified as being part of the development of a climate for community education. The ability to employ procedures related to goal establishment and implementation of policy consistent with district philosophy were classified as part of the philosophy, goal setting, and policy implementation aspects of community education, whereas the evaluation of the community education program in relation to education program goals was deemed program evaluation.

Once again, the most important aspect of any analysis of competencies relates to having ample evidence that the competency is demonstrated. With respect to the ability to clarify roles and responsibilities the basic evidence is that of developing job descriptions. Here again, the mere development of job description is not sufficient because the performance on the job within the framework of this area would be evidenced. With respect to the generation of a supportive attitude with the staff and community, the evidence is the extent to which staff and community actually do participate in activities that are part of the community education program. The principal obviously must also participate, but it's the people for whom the community education program is developed, and their participation, that is extremely important. The establishment of a representative community council, and obviously the seeking and use of input from the council in the establishment of procedures and organizational goals, provide the evidence that this particular competency has been acquired.

Too frequently those of us who are involved in the development of a program where a series of activities or any criteria for performance are developed seem to feel that we are also in a position to evaluate somewhat exclusively whether or not that which we have done has been good. None of us programs for failure, and yet sometimes in retrospect we acknowledge failure just simply by the revisions of programs that we employ. With respect to evaluation, many, many times comparative statistics can be employed that are not technical in nature and can provide the person, in this instance the school principal, the community school principal, an understanding of whether or not that which is being done in reality is good. For example,on a single page evaluation form, some fifteen or so characteristics or atributes of a given program can be identified. The participants either collectively or in groups, such as students, parents, teachers or so forth, can readily be asked their assessment of the importance of any of the activities of the community school program. Simultaneously they can be asked their feelings about how effectively the program is carried out. Using appropriate rating scales, perhaps from five to a one, five being high and one being low, agregate ratings of both importance and effectiveness can be acquired arithmatically. A simple t test can be applied to the ratings and differences of ratings to ascertain the relationship between importance and effectiveness. Two other comparisons can be made with this simple kind of evaluative instrument. One certainly is the ranking of inportance and effectiveness of the respective elements of the program by virtue of the ranking of the arithmatical ratings acquired. The other one is the comparison that can be made between the groups. If the principal or the faculty deem that a certain activity is extremely important but the patrons of the community deem that it's relatively unimportant, a simple comparison of the ratings and rankings of the two groups can determine whether there is a real breech of understanding of importance on the part of these two groups, or whether or not there is congruence of perception. And certainly if this kind of a rating system for evaluation is employed it gives the people responsible for the program ample opportunity to examine ways in which gaps can be closed or that an emphasis can be reassigned or remade in order to improve the efficiency of other aspects of the operation of the programs.

With respect to the competency of one's having the ability to comprehend

and implement policy and goals consistent with district policy, an examination of the goals statements that have been developed on behalf of community education activities and the consistency of those statements with the school district philosophy, comprises one aspect of evidence the competency is real within the community school principal. Additional evidence obviously is that of demonstrating knowledge relating to the philosophy of the district as the community school principal performs his various functions.

In these first two examinations of competencies, those dealing with the School District Superintendent and the Community School Principal, only three specific competencies of the total group of sixteen with respect to the superintendent, and five specific competencies with respect to the total of twenty-five that were identified with regard to the community school principal have been cited. In a paper of this nature, it is not possible to be totally comprehensive and totally cover all of the areas in which competencies or issues of this kind appear. Another obvious fact is simply that the number of people who occupy school superintendent positions and principal positions compared to the number of community education coordinators and directors suggests that perhaps we should be providing and giving more attention to people who occupy those particular positions. Therefore, let's first turn to the Community Education Coordinator, a person usually designated at the school district level as being responsible for community education activities and then to the Community Education Director, the person who functions in a community education capacity at the actual school level position. In doing this there is a risk involved, the risk being that of omission.

A total of thirty-three specific competencies for coordinators were identified and examined. The one competency that received the highest assessment of importance on the part of community education coordinators was that of developing regulations which define board policy dealing with community education. On the five point scale, this was rated at a 5.0 degree of importance. Obviously, community education coordinators felt that once the regulations defining board policy have been established and within that framework, so many other things can be done. But, this competency is of prime importance. This particular competency of regulation development was deemed to be at the application level some 85 percent of the time with only 15 percent at the understanding level. A quick examination of the total array of the competencies necessary for a community education coordinator reveals for each, the competency is appropriate at the application and understanding level and not at the familiarity level. A high degree of application is suggested in about half of the situations. The other half suggests the understanding level. Again, none of the competencies were deemed to be merely appropriate at only a familiarity level.

Universities and other educational institutions should take note of the fact that community educators feel the ability to develop regulations is not generally one that is trained for through pre-service training programs. Only approximately 20 percent of the respondents felt that the acquisition of this competency was through pre-training whereas some 50 percent felt that it would be acquired through in-service training. The evidence of this particular competency is best demonstrated through working with district administration in the preparation of appropriate documents pertaining to the community

education program, through working to involve the input of community members in developing workable community education documents, through implementing procedures, and through planning, organizing, and writing a document which is acceptable to the school board as well as to the community. The last portion of that particular evidence, the acceptability of a document, a policy, a statement, or a regulation booklet, that is acceptable to the school board, must be equally acceptable to the community. Once again too frequently, in isolation, educators have developed that which is deemed to be understood and appropriate for themselves and others, but totally without regard to what the clientele of a district would like, or want, or need. It is only in the last few years, that much emphasis has been placed on the business of being really, sincerely and deeply concerned about the attitude of the community with regard to whatever is done to the community. For many years some people have had the privilege of speaking out in behalf of public involvement in decision making, but not very often has it become a reality.

Two extremely important competencies for community education coordinators are those of developing budget information such as sources of funding, cost estimates and so forth and of identifying district community education goals and objectives for the overall program. These two competencies were rated at a 4.9 level of importance, a close second behind the establishment of regulations with respect to community education coordinators. Again, the application level was the most appropriate for these particular competencies, and the acquisition of them was deemed to be slightly more through pre-service training than in-service or through self efforts. The evidence of the acquisition of the competency of developing budget is best provided by developing resource lists of available funding sources, then the preparation of the budget that reflects the goals, objectives and priorities of the program with respect to those funding sources, and finally coordinating with appropriate district staff, all fiscal matters of the community education program. It is absolutely impossible for a community education coordinator at a district level to proceed through the issues of fiscal matters singularly and without awareness or understanding of what the total district program is. It's equally important for the fiscal officer or personnel responsible for fiscal-matters in the district to know completely the implications of the community education program.

With regard to the identification of district community education goals and objectives for the overall program, the utilization of input of committees of the public and others, school personnel, etc., in the development of goals and objectives into a written document is another evidence of the competency having been acquired. The inclusion of input consistent with district goals and objectives as deemed to be consistent by school district personnel not formally assigned to community education would be an additional evidence that the competency has been acquired. Also the re-evaluating of goals and objectives to update and change those goals and objectives, as necessary,would provide further evidence that a community education coordinator is able to identify community education goals as they relate to the overall program.

In review thirty three competencies for community education coordinators were examined. Through the use of the five point scale with five being the highest degree of importance and one being the lowest, twenty-nine of the

thirty-three competencies were deemed to be important at a 4.0 level of importance or higher. This simply suggests that the job description, is extremely complex. Consequently, we must examine the program of preparation for community education coordinators and devise ways in which they can efficiently acquire the competencies that are deemed to be important by and for them. Space will not permit a complete examination of each of the competencies. Even so there are some specific things that we should look at. In the process of examining the competencies relating to community educators, again, not only should we look at the importance like we've done, we should also look at the level of usage, whether it's application, understanding or familiarity. We should look at the preferred means of training to acquire the competency. We should look at the classification of the competency and the evidence that the competency has been acquired. Even though the total picture reveals a very comprehensive examination, that which was reported in the research may or may not be consistent with the kinds of things that would be done here in Brandon or here in Manitoba or anywhere else in Canada or in the world for that matter. The point is that these are examples. The appropriate thing to do is, in a <u>self</u> determination mode, to sit down and determine whatever is appropriate for the community education coordinator, and others, in the districts or in the agencies with which you work as individuals.

Let's return to some of the other competencies that are deemed to be important and a few of the evidences that the competency has been acquired for the Community Education Coordinator.

There were seven competencies sighted that had an average rating of importance of 4.7. These were, the ability to provide advice to the local unit coordinators in the development of goals, the ability to identify resources in the community, the ability to develop programs which have district wide application, the ability to provide pre-service and in-service training and orientation for community education personnel, the ability to clarify the role of community education directors and their relationship to district and local staffs, the ability to compile and correlate the evaluations for district reports and recommendations for future programming, and the ability to develop strategies for accomplishing goals and objectives. Evidences that these particular competencies would be realized would be best demonstrated through the provision of periodic meetings to train directors and techniques and procedures involved in goal attainment, the provision of opportunities for unit directors to input data for needed changes, gathering of information concerning available resources, contacting human resources in the community to solicit support for community schools, the assessment of broad based interests, working with local principals to determine needs, programing of in-service meetings with appropriate items and the identification of them, the actual assuring that provisions have been made for allocations for training and workshops and so forth, and the writing of reports and desseminating them to proper staff indicating the establishment of procedures to obtain necessary data for implementing change.

In the interest of space, and inasmuch as the largest number of community educator positions that are filled are those of community education directors, let's examine some competencies relating to the position of a Community Education Director. Probably the very single most important competency that

a community education director should possess, comes under the classification of a leadership role. A community education director should be able to provide motivation for staff, students and community members for participation in community education programs. That's a competency that must be beyond the familiarity role, it must be above just merely understanding, it must be applied. A community education program can be deemed to be a failure simply because of the lack of the application of providing motivation for involvement. Slightly over 50 percent of dealing with motivation can be acquired in a pre-service experience or in in-service. Even though the research cited above didn't bear it out, if a persons own ability, feelings, skills, attributes, and personality, are not compatible with the training that's received, this particular competency is never going to be acquired. At the same time the evidence that the competency is possessed by the community education director is best demonstrated by the kind of participation that a community has in community education programs. Also, schedule changes and program changes can be made that reflect the interests and concerns and needs and wants of the community. The community education director can actually conduct brainstorming sessions with discussion groups and see that the staff includes their feelings as well as the community. These are all evidences that the motivation has been real. Here again, if the community or staff is not motivated to perform, the leadership function the community education director should possess is non-existent.

High on the assessment of importance of the competencies for Community Education Directors are found three with a very high rating, a rating of 4.9. The three competencies are the recruitment and encouragement of community participation which really is the evidence of the motivation cited above, the competency of one's ability to implement the program, and the ability to promote the operation with day school staff. These competencies are deemed to be about 70 percent at the application level and nearly 30 percent at the understood level. It's suggested that with respect to recruitment and implementation most often the training for the competencies is at a pre-service level. With respect to promoting cooperation with day staff very little is deemed to come from pre-service training. Inservice training, and this would be adapting to one's own circumstances on a localized basis, provides the kind of training that would permit the competency to be in evidence. Also, there's a certain amount of acquisition of the competency on an individual basis. The evidences that these competencies have been acquired are best demonstrated by contacting leaders, agencies, senior citizens, businesses, and other elements of the community, offering classes to all people of all ages, and planning and conducting weekly and monthly council meetings and staff meetings to provide for the input and the involvement of day staff.

Community education directors should be able to establish and maintain positive relationships with school district administrators, school personnel and community members. They should be able to adapt to changing situations concerning community needs. They should educate the community about the community education concept. They should survey, interpret and meet community needs. The evidences that these competencies have been acquired are all contained in three or four very succinct types of statements. Competencies can best be demonstrated by two way communications, including media releases (newspaper and audio), needs assessments, priority establishment, and the development of program to meet the needs of the community. These particular

competencies are related to the leadership function that a community education director possesses. They are also related to public relations, to personnel, and to budget, all of which are extremely important aspects of the total operation of the community education program.

Near the outset of this presentation a suggestion was made that one aspect of community education leadership training that we've been engaged in at Brigham Young University relates to what we choose to call the stewardship model of leadership. Let's return to that to tie some loose ends together.

In light of the diversities of responsibilities and job performance identified above the stewardship model of leadership is applicable in a very general sense to all of the particular types of jobs. Because it is applicable, some basic understandings of what the stewardship model of leadership contains, is appropriate.

The first and basic premise of stewardship is to make it safe for each of us to find our own best way. This concept is one of becoming more responsible for things that we're called upon to do. As individuals we must be in a position of accepting responsibility. We cannot continue to follow somebody else around all the time to ascertain whether or not they fulfill their expectations. Two people don't have the time to have one supervising all of the activities of another. We must be in a position to find our own best way within certain perameters and within certain restrictions. With respect to the stewardship model of leadership we have defined more or less five specific portions, or segments.

The first part of stewardship has to do with appointment or assignment. Community educators need to be in a position to receive from the authority base, whether it be the superintendent, the director, the coordinator, the principal, the public thrcugh the vote, the board of education or what, the actual designation of certain responsibilities that are to be performed. Specific assignments are made whether they be related to establishing a community council or perhaps establishing a community education program containing a series of activities for people of all ages. The actual assignment must be made clear and succinct in such a way that both parties understand exactly what's expected.

The second portion of the stewardship model deals with the allocation of resources. There are three basic kinds of resources that are considered to be allocatable. One, obviously, is the financial resources available in a particular community. Immediately behind financial come the resources of time, and people. The human resources are extremely important because many times human resources can be employed which alleviate the need for a great deal of attention to the financial simply because volunteer people can be found and can do tremendous jobs in community education activities. Another aspect of the financial portion of resources relates of course to buildings and other physical facilities. In many instances those physical facilities can be utilized without any charge. They ought to be without charge in all instances because the schools belong to the public and the public ought to be able to use the schools free of charge. If charges are to be assessed they ought to be through taxation income from the tax base of the community.

The third aspect of the stewardship model of leadership deals with agency. Agency is the business of being independent and being able to exercise one's own initiative. Sometimes we use the term free-agency. In agency we're given the privilege of making mistakes. We have the privilege and opportunity to do things exercising our own initiative. We should be able to capitalize on that which we know and understand, and which is influenced by those with whom we work.

A fourth aspect of the stewardship model of leadership deals with accountability. We should be accountable to the people that have given us the appointment or assignment to do the job. We should be able to be responsive, and in the famous words from the scriptures, receive the admonition from our bosses, "well done thou good and faithful servant." We should be expected to report the activities we've engaged in. And really this is the whole concept of stewardship itself coming to life.

But in the general stewardship model of leadership a fifth dimension is that of assessment. Sometimes we call assessment evaluation. But it's assessing or dealing with the organizational and individual needs as they are evaluated. As performances are evaluated, we modify and restructure for the future.

Many of us believe the stewardship model of leadership is cyclical, where we go through the aspects of it in a spiraling kind, or a cycling kind of operational procedure. We can begin with any one of these particular points and pick up the cycle or the spiral effect at that entry point.

The focus of the stewardship model is on leadership and service. In focusing on service and overall leadership, we've classified, for lack of a better title or term, three generations of stewardship. The first generation deals with how we treat each other, how we get along with each other either as individuals or in groups and organizations. There is research to back up the premise that superintendents and other administrators and other educators for that matter, get fired most frequently, some 80 percent of the time in fact, for a lack of ability to get along with people and not a lack of skill in performing the tasks that are assigned to them. This lack of ability to get along with people could be the superintendent that gets fired because he can't get along with his Board of Education or a principal that gets fired because he can't get along with his teachers. Even the community educator can get fired because he or she is out of step with his community.

The second generation of stewardship deals with the technical skills--how we do our job--the way in which a program is established--the actual scheduling of classes and activities so that no conflict of facility utilization occurs--that budgets are actually important--that we stay within budgets. The technical skills of doing the job really constitute what we call a second generation of stewardship.

The third generation of stewardship deals with what we ought to do, what we ought to plan for, what the future ought to hold. Sometimes we call it futuring, sometimes we call it planning, sometimes we call it planning and futuring, but the issue of third generation is what ought to be.

13.

What is suggested here is that if we take a look at the competencies of community educators, we ought to think in terms of stewardship that a position holds. We ought to be able to know how to allocate our resources, be agents for the exercising of independence and initiative, being accountable for the assignment we've been given, and be able to assess and identify the needs for improvement of programs in the future. All this ought to be done under the basic premise of "making it safe to find our own best way." It ought to be done with the caution that a minimum standard, a minimum competency, a minimum level of performance cannot rest on the laurels of being a maximum. There are specific competencies that we all need to know about and utilize with respect to the kinds of assignments that we have as community educators, whether it be a superintendent or a community school district, a principal of a community school, a coordinator in a school district responsible for community education activities of a director of community school activities at a localized level.

NOTE: Community educator competencies for Community School Superintendent, Principal, Coordinator and Director have been organized into display chart form. The comprehensive content of the charts is organized in the same manner as the above presentation. Copies or sets of the charts are available from the Rocky Mountain Community Education Center, 302 McKay Building, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602